

THE UDĀTTA AS KEY-STONE OF THE DECIPHERING CODE FOR THE ṚGVEDA-SAMHITA

I. - THE UDĀTTA'S PROSODICAL VALUE

The attention of ṛgvedic scholars is directed to this writer's previous publications on this topic, especially in *Annals* (B.O.R.I. — Diamond Jubilee Vol.) and to the *references* mentioned therein, besides the article in the *Bombay Univ. Journal* (Arts) which will have already appeared by the time the present essay is published (cf. particularly, *Annals*, loc. cit. pp. 615 ff.). The meaning of this *archaic prosodical* value of the udātta will be made clear by what may be rightly considered as the « shibboleth » of this archaic versifying factor.

Note: for our archaic *Pp-like* (no saṃdhis;!) text-transcription and *conventional signs* (on the right-hand margin at the pāda-end) we use mainly: = (no change), × (changed word-order), + (emendation — given in *italics* in the text), S(substitution), L(length-value for a « hrasva » in the rhythm-scheme), A(length-value for accent), R(resolution of kṣaipras, vowels or saṃdhis), H(haplology), d(deletion), I(insertion). If a saṃdhi is metre-demanded a + between the words concerned is inserted in the text. Long vowels: ā, ī, ū, ṛ. A short vowel with length-value appears as ä, i, ü, r; a long vowel with accent as â, î, û, ṛ or ă, ı, ŭ, ʀ. Diphthongs go in archaic form: e=ai, o=au, ai=āi, au=āu; if resolved, they are: ayi, avu... or a-i, a-u...; aai, aau; and long vowels: ā=aa..., Any other details will be clear from the context*.

The staple-references are to Con(ordance, Vedic), Gr(assmann's *Ṛgveda-Wörterbuch*), G(eldner's Translation) O(ldenberg's *Noten*), without further specification, since they are *ad loc.* or *s. v.*, naturally. And mark (as we have often repeated!) that the trenchant strictures passed here (and elsewhere) — on the *editorial Samhitā-Kāra* (=SK)

* For typographic reasons ä, i, ü, r with accent will go as ä, î, û, ṛ (or ʀ). The same for r with accent = ʀ. The intelligent reader will easily discern them, it is hoped. A final * in a text-line means: text improvable - which applies to its *commentary* too! See note at this article's end! N.B.

agency and its « traditional » text (or devotees) — are not meant to question their « good intentions », but to awaken ṛgvedic scholarship to the deleterious effect that the said SK-agency's misguided « palimpsesting method » has had on the *original* (and immeasurably *superior*!) ṛṣi-kavis' own *ur-text*, which we are bent on reconstructing — for their own due honour and India's and Indology's benefit — by means of our rational-text-critical approach. — « satyam-eva-jayatai ».

And now for the texts in question.

V, 33, 5

- | | | |
|---|---------------|---|
| a) vayāṃ tay indra táva yá-+iva nāraḥ(!) | (SK!) ×SIA(!) | |
| b) śárdhaḥ jajñānāḥ yaatām sa-rātham(!) | (SK!) SA+(!) | |
| c) á+asmān(!) jagamyāḥ ahi-sušma sá tvām(!) | (SK!) +S(!) | * |
| d) bhágaḥ ná háv- yāḥ prabhṛthaiṣu āyáuḥ(!) | (SK!) RHS+ | * |

cf. VII, 30, 4

- | | | |
|--|----------------------|---|
| a) vayāṃ tay indra táva yá-+iva nāraḥ(!) | (SK!) (supra) | |
| b) śárdhaḥ jajñānāḥ yaatām sa-rātham(!) | (N.B.) (SK!) S+LH | |
| c) yácchā sūribhyaḥ utá nā-+várūtham | (N.B.) (SK!) (supra) | |
| d) su-ābhúvaḥ jaraṇām c-+aśnavāma(!) | (N.B.) (SK!) RHI+(!) | * |

+X, 65, 4

- | | | |
|---|-----------|---|
| c) prkṣāḥ iva maháyantā- su-rātáyāḥ | (N.B.) LH | * |
| d) daivá- stavantai(!) mánuṣāsa- sūráyaḥ(!) | (SK!) H+ | * |

+X, 32, 9

- | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| a) aitām naḥ bhadrá dádataḥ maghāni | (N.B.) (SK!) ×+S | |
| b) kalāśam kīru-śravaṇam kriyāta(!) | | |
| | (cf. c!) (N.B.) (SK!) ×A+(!) | |
| c) dānāḥ ít vaḥ, maghavānā-, sá astu | (cf. b!) (SK!) LSH | |
| d) ayāṃ ca sáumaḥ yāṃ ḥṛḍī bíbharmi | (N.B.) (SK!) ×L | * |

We had previously used these very texts, centered on the first two, for an accent-length shibboleth proof, yet trying to preserve much more of the SK's palimpsest. We *did* solve the metrical-mechanical difficulties in function of the accent, but not the *total* sense, which comes into its own only with the above restoration, sense+idiom+context-demanded! It should be obvious to an attentive text-critic, that the kavi's intended *main* sense *must* have been: « We are yours, Indra, just-like the maruts are too; (hence) come to our aid ». But the SK's vyākaraṇa prevents him from seeing or expressing *that*, since *he* cannot use the archaic haplology « yá-+iva », which for him can only be « yáy iva » or « yái va », which latter he turns into « yái ca » misled by *his* « ca » in 8b! And he can't see the sense of « tai+táva » in the *same* sentence (thinks *he*!) — hence, misled by the pseudomodel in *his* mishandled 2a (« ná tái tay indra asmád ādhi ṛjráḥ »), he « improves » *his* 5a into « vayāṃ tái tai », where « tái » makes no sense (*pace omnes*!), as against 2a, where it rightly *does* (q.v.). Hence, he confusingly misses-messes the kavi's sense-making: « We are yours, like those men who were born as your troop fellow-riders *on* (your) chariot ». And here again

the blundering vidūṣaka-SK, misled by the surrounding *nomin. pl.*, misadapts the pāda-end into «yātās ca rāthāḥ», because of «jajñānāḥ», of course (mis-analysing «yātām+s» as «yātās arātham» and miscorrecting it into «ca rāthāḥ» — to suit «yātāḥ»!) — but look up Gr., s.v. «sa-rātha-» for enlightenment! And now — with *our text*! — the sequel should follow smoothly: «So, as such, you come to us, you impetuous one — who are to be invoked in *human* offerings». But look at the SK turning it all into a foolish 3rd person address(!) obviously for caviar to the general of the all-gobbling SK-acolytes! («risum teneatis?»). And look at the text changes and substitutions he makes to save *his* vyākaraṇa and to paper over his rejection or ignorance of archaic haplogologies, etc. — Finally note that here we have, as in numerous supporting cases, as we shall see, the short *a* (in «nārah, sa-rūtham») considered by the *kavi* as *equivalently long* under the influence of *both* the accent *and* the rhythm-position (cf. «yácchā», *without* final accent, but as word-final-syllable: cf. VI, 30, 4c, in a rhythm-protected position). — The SK (=Saṃhitā-Kāra) editor can do nothing about it without ruining the metre (*and* sense) still further with his quantity-only prosody (vs. the archaic kavis' quantity+accent+position one) and, therefore, he has to lump it — as «ārṣa», poor fellow! — forced by the numerous other such cases, of which «jāna- pāñca jānāḥ» are conspicuous examples (in triṣṭubh-ends), cf. Gr. for clever near-miss remarks on those words (q.v.). But the moment our SK gets half a chance, he desperately tries — in pukka «traditional» vidūṣaka-panḍitś style — to dodge that «flaw» (thins *he*!) by somehow varying the *subsequent* parallel texts, especially to avoid trite punar-ukti — as above, in the obvious case of VII, 30, 4 vs. V, 35, 5 even against the natural demands of context and style, with his patchy «deva» vs. the («unmetrical») «nārah» of the original. And in this the editor-SK goes much further than might be considered believable otherwise, precisely because of the natural repetitive trend of the *anthological collection* (of closely similar themes, traditional style and common circumstances!) to be memorised and repeated by a *professional* class of reciters, who, besides, need some kind of safeguard against confusing similarity and-or identity of phraseology, especially in the *pratīka*-headings of pādas, stanzas *and* hymns. Naturally, a traditionally-bred *composing* *kavi* will borrow choice phrases or pādas and even hemistichs and take pride in completing or adapting them in an ingenious or unexpected manner; but an SK, in an *anthology*, with many such cases crowded together, will fight shy of such «monotonous poverty-stricken» echo-effect.

A striking case in point is VII, 30, 4 vs. its *preceding* (in the SK-order!) V, 33, 5. The two stanzas being so similarly styled and structured, we naturally expect:

VII, 30, 4

- a) vayām tay indra táva yá-+iva nārah(!)
- b) śárdhah jajñānāḥ yaatām sa-rūtham

But we see the obvious SK-hand spiriting away the (for *him*!) defaulting « *nāraḥ* » and twisting 4b into a patch-work (cf. X, 65, 4b+32, 9b!) directed towards the *patrons* in 4cd, but callously leaving in the air the correspondent term to the *prominent* « *vayām* » in 4a, while patching the gap with a « *upamām* »(!) *filched brazenly* from the closely-neighbouring 3b! (a gaffe that no self-respecting *kavi* will even dream of committing!). Everything-clamours-for-the-kavi's-original:

VII, 30, 4

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| a) <i>vayām</i> (!) <i>tay indra, tāva yá+iva nāraḥ</i> | (N.B.) × + SA |
| b) <i>śārdhaḥ jajñānāḥ yaatām sa-rātham</i> (!) | (N.B.) SA + |
| c) <i>yācchā surībhyah utā nā-(!) vārūtham</i> | (N.B.) SHL |
| d) <i>su-ābhūvaḥ jaraṇām c+asnavāma</i> (!) | (N.B.) R + * |

Here it should be clear that the SK is also dodging the ā-anuprāsa in 4d). And we may add here for confirmation of 4b+V, 33, 5b (in our first tentative solution above):

X, 40, 1

- | | |
|---|------------|
| a) <i>rātham yāntam kūha kṛ-vaam nārā</i> | (SK!) dRHL |
| b) <i>prāti dyumāntam suv-itāya bhūṣati</i> | = |

+I, 141, 8

- | | |
|---|----------------|
| a) <i>agnīḥ yān rāthaḥ nā śīkvabhiḥ kṛtāḥ</i> | (SK!) IR × |
| b) <i>ū- dyām āngaibhiḥ aruśāibhiḥ īyatai</i> | (SK!) HI(!) |
| c) <i>āt asya tāi kṛṣṇāḥ dakṣi sūrāyaḥ</i> (!) (cf. G.+Gr.) | (?) |
| d) <i>sūrāsyā nā tvaīśāthāt īṣatai vāyaḥ</i> | (SK!) S(?) |
| = c) <i>āt asya tyāi</i> (!) <i>sūriyā+n+ākṣi kṛṣṇāḥ</i> | (SK!) ×SRHI(!) |
| = d) <i>sūrāsyā nā tvaīśāthāt vāyaḥ īṣatai</i> (cf. b!) | (SK!) ×SA(!) |

(For the SK's metrical mess and messy vidūṣaka-text, especially in 8c, cf. Gr.+G., all at sea! The above text-critical reconstruction *alone* can make sensible style, sense *and* metre! For further SK-manhandlings cf. the « fillers » in X, 40, 1a and the metrical butchery in X, 141, 8a (to « pair » *his* messed 8b), and in 8c to match 8d! But the SK-acolytes *will* gobble up anything without wincing, of course. Note too the above X, 65, 4c, where the SK dodges *his* faulty pāda-final *main* rhythm by intruding *his* odd « *mānuṣāya* » (pace G.!). But there was no metrical flaw for the *kavi* who used a normal-archaic haplology (which alone makes sense, q.v.). Let us add here the SK's mis-śruti+mis-analysis+mis-correction causing further errors in V, 33, 5a (« *tai* » for « *tāva* », « *yai ca* » for « *yá+iva* »), 5b (« *yātās ca rāthāḥ* » for « *yaatām sa-rātham* » — how the Maruts, or anyone, can be « *yātās ca rāthāḥ* » is nobody's business!), 5c (« *ahi-śuṣma-satvā* »!? — for « *sá tvām* », cf. 5ab, and « *jagamyāt* » for « *jagamyāḥ* », which is *the* right form=2nd. p. optative, as context-demanded, cf. *ab* too), 5d (mis-analysis of the hapl. « *hāv- yāḥ* », context-indicated, and the odd « *cāruḥ* » for « *āyāuḥ* » to save *his* verse+vyākaraṇa vs. V, 41, 19d!).

The same can be said of the parallel, VII, 30 4a (as above, and

« daiva » filched from X, 65, 4d for rhythm+variety), 4b (« śárdhaḥ » vs. the SK's « śūra » from 1d+2c(!) against the context) of 4a for variety, as said; 4c (to save his 4b context+verse — wrongly), 4d (pseudo-kṣaipra, verse-ruining, and *full* subject missing, by SK's mis-correction of « aśna-vāma », cf. « Gr., s.v. « aś » in *parasm.*!). In X, 65, 4c with rhythm-lengthening of the final word-hrasva together with haplology as in VII, 30, 4c!, in the cases of « maháyantā- » and « utá nū- »); in 4d (as said) an outrageous case-change by our SK vidūṣaka-pañḍit — who is simply averse to or ignorant of the kavi's haplology. — to get *his* end-rhythm! — But cf. Gr. for parallels+sense vs. the SK's foolish filching from I, 117, 21b! (context!).

The result is a typically representative specimen of the Saṃhitā-text as SK-palimpsested distortion of the ṛṣi-kavis' genuine and far-superior and perfectly metrical and sense-making R̥gveda in its pristine form of quantity-cum-accent-cum-position metre, prosody and language-idiom.

And now the irrefragable testimony of those bisyllabic words is solidly confirmed by that of *tri*-syllabic ones in their serried battallions of « āvasai, āvasaḥ, āvasā », and similar nouns (« sāhas, śāvas... » together with « ātithiḥ », etc., which had already led the master=mind of an Oldenberg (in his excellent « Prolegomena » — too woefully neglected by Indian ṛgvedic scholarhip, alas!) to the clever near-miss of postulating a *special* way of pronunciation, though *not* of formation (as « āvas », etc.) for « those words », *all* of them marked by the one *single common* characteristic of the « udātta » accent!, which is what forced the present writer to the *only* possible logical conclusion (the crown of fifty years of text-critical ṛgvedic research) of the *prosodical length-equivalent* value of that accent under the influence of the *metrical rhythm-scheme*.

And this showed that the R̥gveda kavis were in an archaic-linguistic stage of accent+quantity-prosody, while the trend of the living language was beginning to develop into the *post*-vedic, *pre*-classic and finally *classic* style of *quantity-only* metrical prosody, where accent simply does not *count* or even any more *exist*. And this was the linguistic-prosodical stage in which the SK-agency (about five-hundred years later!) lived and gave the final shape to the « traditional » Saṃhitā in what Oldenberg (with Arnold, « Vedic Metre ») calls its « orthoepic diaskeuasis ». Hence came the SK's « love's labour lost » of *transposing* the *archaic* text-state into the *new* one by steering a midway course between the two, preserving as far as possible the characteristics of the *ancient* « chandas » while incorporating the *later* standards of *his* own « vyākaraṇa » as *paramount*, even *against* the kavi's own archaic vyākaraṇa, saṃdhi and chandas *in case of conflict*! But that swap *had* to mislead the SK far beyond the mere orthoepy, since the change in « pronunciation only » often altered and ruined the very soul of a « ṛg » — its *rhythm*! Hence comes Arnold's justified remark that even alone the indiscriminate

kṣaipra-value of *y*, *v* turns the *Ṛgveda* into a « *padya-veda* » as far as its metrical value is concerned, not to speak of other values, which is bad enough!

But the SK is concerned with more than mere pronunciation: he wants — as already indicated — to produce a « *rg-veda* », as far as his traditional material permits, with as *few* as possible but as *many* as *required* changes, within rather broad limits of sense-preserving and even « improving » (according to *his* lights) — and to present to the *śiṣṭās* of *his* time a text worthy of the *ṛṣis* and of *his* cultured audience and *its* younger literary taste and standards. The very fact of the SK's systematic « updating » of the *whole* *Ṛgveda* text in function of *his* younger « *vyākaraṇa* », rough-shod trampling not only on the old one but, what is more, on the *rg's* *vital-essential metre and rhythm*, evidently proves that the SK *is not* and *will not be* a mere echo-transmitter (as the *post-Saṃhitā* tradition, exceptionally for India, did become as a sort of literary « *tour de force* »!) but an *editor-redactor* with *extra-textual* objectives and standards, *besides* and *beyond* and even *against* the *mere* literal fidelity, more in the line of the incorrigibly correcting-improving trends of the *Mahābh.* + *Rāmāy.* text-transmission — the typically Indian one, even in the age of manuscriptal handing down! Hence the transpositions, substitutions modifications and changes of all sorts that we observe in the three texts above — besides misinterpretations of the oral-auricular *śruti*! — are the natural result of *misguided care that loved its object only too well but disastrously unwisely*! Add to this (as already pointed out) that the SK was the *compiler-editor* of a *collection* of hymns (of traditionally conventionally repetitive themes and bards!) to be memorised with their treacherously memory-confusing similar+identical *pratīkas* and phraseology and often boring sameness (the decried « *punar-ukti* » of the « *śiṣṭāḥ* »!) — and you have all the ingredients that go to make a « *Saṃhitā-Palimpsest* » as typified by the above sample-texts, particularly with the aggravating circumstance of the SK's « *salto mortale* » from the *archaic* accent-quantity prosody to *his* own *quantity-only* classical one. And as for seeing parallelisms and possibilities of patching one text with shreds of another (as bits of one all-embracing *śruti*!) — *that* is child's play for memorising virtuosi who had the *whole* *Ṛgveda* at their memory's finger-tips!

II. - CONFIRMATION FROM ALL SIMILAR CASES

With the above findings and principles in mind we can now proceed to give a full confirmation from all parallel cases noted by Grassmann concerning in particular the three key-words: « *nāraḥ*, *rātha- jāna-* » spread through the *whole* *Ṛgveda* and thereby showing that this prosodic factor, is part of the *basic* versifying system of the *ṛṣi-kavis* excep-

tionally preserved as « āṛṣa » by the palimpsesting SK, precisely because of the impossibility of effacing it, given the multiplicity of its occurrences, and in spite of his vidūṣaka-tricks to evade its *verse-wrecking* consequences from the angle of *his* quantity-only orthoepic prosody as against the kavis' archaic one, including accent and rhythmical length, besides other stylistic devices, especially *haplology*. The following are the texts, given with the accompanying conventional signs of the *archaic* features which the SK's « editorial dynamism » had to eliminate in order to achieve the « quantum leap » of *his* prosodical-linguistic *transposition*! This will be crowned by the *complete reconstruction* of the *two hymns* where our « shibboleth » stanza recurs in order to give proof palmary that our system and principles *do* work and apply *fully* and satisfactorily to *entire* textual-literary units as legitimate representatives of the *entire* R̥gveda of the ṛṣi-kavis and *against* the SK's disfiguring-distorting Saṃhitā-Palimpsest, which is one!

V, 33, 5

- a) vayāṃ tay indra tāva yá-+iva(!) nāraḥ
(vs. 3ab) (SK!) X+×SA(!)
- b) śárdhaḥ jajñānāḥ yaatām sa-rāthaṃ (infra!) (SK!) RSA+
- c) á+asmān jagamyāḥ ahi-śuṣma sá tvám(!) (N.B.) (SK!) +S *
- d) bhágaḥ ná háv- yáḥ prabhṛtháishu āyáduḥ(!)
(V, 41, 19d) (SK!) RHS+ *
- (For 5d cf. III, 50, 2d+V, 33, 7d!+VII, 29, 3c)

VII, 30, 4

- a) vayāṃ tay indra tāva yá-+iva(!) nāraḥ
(cf. supra) (SK!) S×+A
- b) śárdhaḥ jajñānāḥ yaatām sa-rāthaṃ (supra!) (SK!) S+A
- c) yácchā sūrībhyāḥ utá nā- várūthaṃ (N.B.) (SK!) ×LH
- d) su-ābhúvaḥ jaraṇāṃ c-+aśnavāma(!) (N.B.) (SK!) R+IH *
- (In 4ab SK for variety vs. V, 33, 5ab; cf. X, 32, 2b+65, 4cd)

cf. X, 32, 9

- a) aitam naḥ bhadrá dádataḥ magháni (N.B.) (SK!) X+S *
- b) kalāśaṃ kūru-śravaṇaṃ kriyāta(!)
(cf. c!) (N.B.) (SK!) XA+(!) *
- c) dānāḥ ít vaḥ, maghavānā-, sá astu (cf. b!) (SK!) LSH
- d) ayāṃ ca sáumaḥ yāṃ hrđi bíbharmi (SK!) ×L *

+65, 4

- c) prkśāḥ iva maháyantā- su-rātáyāḥ (SK!) HL *
- d) daivā- stavantai(!) mánuṣāsa- sūráyāḥ (N.B.) (SK!) H+(!) *
- (For V, 33, 5a+VII, 30, 4a above — cf.):

II, 19, 1

- a) ápāyi asyá ándhasaḥ mādāya (SK!) R
- b) mánīṣiṇaḥ svaanásyā práyaḥ yát(!) (SK!) R+I
- c) yásmīn índraḥ pra-dívi vāvṛdhānāḥ +L
- d) áukaḥ dadháí daivayántas ca nāraḥ(!) (N.B.) (SK!) SA(!)

(For 1d cf. 8c+Gr.+):

I, 115, 2

- c) yātrā nāraḥ daivayāntaḥ yugāni (N.B.) =
 d) vi-tanvatāi bhadarā prāti bhadram (cf. G.) (SK!) $\times R + A(!)$

II, 19, 8

- a) aivā tai grtsa-madā- sūra mánmā (SK!) (cf. c!) $+ A \times I(!)$
 b) vayūnā ná avasyāvaḥ tatakṣuḥ(!) (N.B.) (SK!) $+ A \times I(!)$
 c) brahmaṇyāntaḥ indara tāi nāvīyah (N.B.) (SK!) (cf. a!) $R +$
 d) ūrjām iṣaṃ su-kṣitīm sumnām aśyuh (SK!) $\times L$
 (There is *no unredupl. perf.* of « takṣ » — vs. Gr!). Cf.:

X, 39, 4

- a) yuvāṃ cyāvānaṃ sanāyaṃ ná rāth- narā (SK!) HIS(!)
 b) pūnar yūvānaṃ carāthāi(!) tatakṣathuḥ (SK!) $+ I(!)$

+III, 8, 6

- a) yān vaḥ nāraḥ daivayāntaḥ ni-mimiyūḥ =
 b) vānas-patai svādhitiḥ vā tatākṣa(!) (N.B.) =

+VI, 1, 2

- c) tāṃ tvā nāraḥ prathamāṃ daivayāntaḥ =
 d) mahāi raay- citāyantāḥ ānu gman (N.B.) (SK!) $H + RL$

II, 34, 11

- c) yatāsrucāḥ hiraṇya-varṇaan kakuh- (SK!) $\times H(!)$
 d) brahmaṇyāntaḥ śāmsīyaṃ rādhaḥ imahai (N.B.) R

+I, 62, 3

- a) índrasya ca āngirasāṃ ca iṣṭāu (SK!) IR(!)
 b) dhāsim sarāmā tánayāi vivāida(!) (cf. c!) (SK!) $\times A + S(!)$
 c) bṛhas-pātiḥ bhinat ādrim vidāt gāḥ (SK! vs. b!) =
 d) sám usrīyābhiḥ vāvāsanta nāraḥ(!) (SK!) SA(!)

+IV, 38, 9

- a) utā smā asya panayanti jñāḥ(!) (SK!) RA(!)
 b) jūtīm kṛṣṭiprāḥ abhī-bhūtim āśauḥ =

+I, 89, 10

- c) vísvai daivāḥ áditiḥ páñca jñāḥ(!) (SK!) A(!)

cf.

- a) ádītiḥ(!) dyāuḥ áditiḥ antāriḁṣam (N.B.) (SK!) L(!)
 b) ádītiḥ(!) mātā sá pitā sá putráḥ (N.B.) (SK!) L(!)
 d) ádītiḥ(!) jātām áditiḥ janitvām (N.B.) (SK!) L(!)

+VI, 11, 4

- c) ayūṃ ná yāṃ námasa rātá-havyāḥ =
 d) añjānti su-prayāsaṃ páñca jñāḥ(!) (SK!) A(!)

+51, 11

- a) tái nāḥ dyāvā- prthivī índra-+vardhan (SK!) $\times HS(!)$
 b) pūṣā bhágaḥ áditiḥ páñca jñāḥ(!) (SK!) A(!)
 d) bhāvantu naḥ su-traatrāḥ(!) su-gaupāḥ (SK!) $+ R(!)$

+II, 20, 2

- a) *tuvām naḥ indra ūtībhiḥ tuvābhiḥ* (N.B.) (SK!) R × + (!) *
 b) *abhiṣṭi-pāḥ tuvāyat- āsi jñān(!)* (N.B.) (SK!) × HRLA (!) *
 c) *tuvām ināḥ daasūṣā- + varūtā* (SK!) RLH (!)
 d) *itthā-dhiḥ yāḥ (!) abhi-nákṣati tvā* (SK!) × + R

+III, 46, 2

- a) *mahān asi mahiṣa vṣṇīyaibhiḥ* R
 b) *dhana-spṛt ugra sāhamānaḥ anyān* =
 c) *āikā- + víśvasya bhúvan- āsi rájā* (SK!) HIS (!)
 d) *sá yaudháyā ca kṣayáyā ca jñān(!)* (SK!) A (!)

+VI, 10, 5

- a) *nú naḥ citráṃ puru-vājābhiḥ ūtí-* (N.B.) (SK!) HAR (!)
 b) *ágnai rayīm maghāvadhbhya- + utá dhaihi* (SK!) + RA
 c) *yái rádhāsā śrávasā c- + āti anyān* (SK!) + H (!)
 d) *su-viriyāiḥ ca abhi-sánti jñān(!)* (SK!) (cf. c!) H + I
 (G.'s comment on 5cd wrong!!) — cf.:

VII, 16, 10

- a) *yái rádhāmsi áśvíyā dādatī maghā* (SK!) RAL (!)
 b) *kāmaina śrávasaḥ mahāḥ* =

N.B. — The kavis do *not* feel bound to use words like « jána- rátha-náraḥ » in a particular verse-position. This is evident from the way they can use them in any other metrically correct setting but it is particularly made clear by the freedom they — or the SK? — show in the employment of even composite phrases like « páñca jánāḥ » (cf. Gr.):

I, 89, 10

- c) (cf. supra: pāda-end)

III, 59, 8

- a) *mitrāya páñca yaimirai* (SK!) = (?)
 b) *jánāḥ abhiṣṭi-śāvasai* (SK!) A (?)
 c) *daivān víśvān bibharti sá* (SK!) × (?)
 = a) *mitrāy- abhiṣṭi-śāvasai* (SK!) XHA (!)
 = *c) *daivān víśvān bibharti yāḥ* (N.B.) (SK!) XAR (!)
 = *b) *yaimirai páñca jānaaḥ (!)* (N.B.) (SK!) + XS (!)

(This whole *unique hymn* — cf. G. — in its 3 parts is a « shibboleth » of SK-palimpsesting, esp. in (I) 1acd + 2abd (!) + 3a; (II) 5(!)a (!)d + 4(!)b; (III) 6abs (!) + 7abc + 8abc + 9abc (!) — Would-be-critic « jāgrhi »! You stand or fall by *this* test!).

VI, 11, 4

- a) (cf. supra: pāda-end)

VII, 51, 11

- b) (cf. supra: pāda-end)

X, 45, 6

- d) *jánāḥ yát agním áyajanta páñca* (N.B.) (SK!) (?)
 = *yát agním á-yajanta páñca jñān(!)* (kavi vs. SK!) XA (!)
 = *yát páñca jñāḥ áyajanta agním* (SK!) + HI (?)

- = yát páñca agním áyajanta jñāḥ (SK!) ×A(?)
 = yát agním páñca áyajanta jñāḥ (SK!) ×A(?)
 !c) vidūṃ cit s-+ádrim abhinat parā-yán (SK!) ×R(?)

(The *kavis* could use any alternative *d*-form here; but not the SK! —
 For the SK only the first was «regular» — pāda-order *dc*!)

X, 53, 4

- c) *ūurja-ādaḥ utā yajñīyāsaḥ* (cf. 5b) (SK!) L(!)
 d) *pāñcā janāḥ māmā hautrām juṣadhvam* (SK!) L(!)

X, 53, 5

- a) *pāñcā jñāḥ māmā hautrām juṣantām* (SK!)
 b) *gáu-jātaaḥ utā yái yajñīyāsaḥ* (cf. 4c!) (SK!) R

VIII, 32, 22

- b) *ihī páñca jñān āti* (SK!) (?)
 = *ihī páñc- āti jñāna(!)* (SK!) ×ra(!)

IX, 92, 3

- d) *dhīrāḥ ānu yatatai páñca jñān* (SK!) ×LA(!)

The SK *has* to twist to try, if possible, to get *his* quantity-only rhythm vs. the *kavis*' ample choice with quantity+*accent* prosody! But they also had *conventional* trends, like *final* « jñāḥ + páñca jñāḥ », as above, especially the latter, mostly in spite of the SK's twists!

V, 33

- 1 a) *māhī mahái nar -dīdhiyai tavāsai(!)* (N.B.) L×HRA(!)
 b) *īndrāy-+ahām távyasa-+itthā átavyān* (N.B.) ×RHI
 c) *yāḥ asmāai(!) samarīyaḥ cikaitta* (N.B.) (cf. Gr.) SA×+(!)
 d) *jānāi(!) stutāḥ sumatīm vāja-sānim* (cf. 7d!) (cf. Gr.) S+A(!)

cf. X, 91

- 15 c) *asmái suvīraṃ rayīm vāja-sānim* (SK!) ×A(!)
 2 a) *sá tvām naḥ indra dhiyasānāḥ arkāiḥ* =
 b) *hāriṇaam yauktaram vṛṣaṇ asraiḥ* (N.B.) +RLA(!)
 c) *itthā yaaḥ maghavan ānu jáuṣam* (N.B.) +RA×(!)
 d) *vákṣāḥ abhi aryá- sakṣi prá jñān(!)* (N.B.) ×LHRA(!)
 3 a) *ná tái tay indra háray-+asmát ādhi(!)* (cf. c+5a!) ASH+×(!)
 b) *áyuktāsaḥ a-brahmatā yāth-+āsan* (N.B.) ASR
 c) *ā- tiṣṭha tām ráth- ādhi vajra-hasta* (cf. a!) (N.B.) +HI×
 d) *raśmīnā+iva yūmasay ā suv-ášvam* (N.B.) S+ARH×
 4 a) *purū yá tai indara sánti tá ukth-* (N.B.) +RHI
 b) *urvārāsu gáuṣu cakārtha yúdhyan* (N.B.) ×+AH
 !d) *tuvām samātsu dāasasya vādhah(!)* (N.B.) dSRA(!)
 !c) *tatākṣīṣai dīriyāy áukasi svái* (N.B.) S+R(!)

- 5 a) vayām tay indra tāva yá-+iva nārah (SK: 3a!) ×A+(!)
- b) śárdhaḥ jajñānāḥ yaatām sa-rātham(!) (N.B.) +RA(!)
- c) á+asmān jagamyāḥ ahi-śuśma sá tvām(!) (N.B.) +S(!) *
- d) bhāgaḥ na hāv- yāḥ prabhṛtháišu āyāuḥ
(V, 41, 19b) (N.B.) +HISAd *
- 6 a) pṛkṣāniyam indara tvái hí áujah (N.B.) (SK!) SR+
- b) utā nṛmṇām nṛtama nār amṛta(!) (N.B.) (SK!) ×SL+A(!)
- c) sá áiniṃ ná vasav ā- naḥ rayim dāḥ (SK!) +SHI
- d) prá tai stuṣai tuvi-magh- arya dānam
(cf. Gr.) (N.B.) ×+I(!)
- 7 a) aivá indra uutibhiḥ naḥ āva (N.B.) RA×(?)
- b) utā sūra gr̥ṇatāḥ pāhi kārūn (N.B.) ×LHI
- c) utā piprihi su-sutásya cārauḥ (cf. 5d) (N.B.) ×L
- d) mádhvaḥ tvácam dádata- vāja-sātāu (cf. 1cd!) (N.B.) ×H(!)
- 8 a) utá tyái pāuru-kutsiyásya sūrāiḥ dR
- b) trasā-dasyauḥ hiraṇináḥ rárānāḥ L
- c) dáśa śyáitasaḥ mā vahantu áśvāḥ(!) (SK!) (cf. G.) ×LR+
(V, 41, 19d) (N.B.) +HISAd
- d) gāiri-kṣitásya krátubhiḥ nú saścai =
- 9 a) utá tyái mā mārutá+áśvasya śáuṇāḥ(!) (cf. 8cl) =
- b) krátvā-maghāsaḥ vidáthasya rātāu =
- c) sahasra- mai cyávatānaḥ dádānaḥ (N.B.) +H
- d) ānūkām aryāḥ vápuṣai ná ārcat R
- 10 a) utá tyái mā dhuvaníyasya júṣtāḥ (cf. 8cl) R
- b) su-rūcaḥ ca lakṣmantýas- yátānāḥ(!) (N.B.) IHA 2
- c) mahná rāyāḥ saṃváraṇasya řśaiḥ RA(!)
- d) vrajām ápi gman prá-yatāḥ ná gávaḥ (SK!) XL
- (For special samples of accent+rhythm-value+archaism cf.: 1ad+2bcd+3abcd+4ac+5ab+6b+7abc+10bcd).

VII, 30

- 1 a) á naḥ patai śavasaḥ indra yāhi (SK!) S+×(!)
- *c) mahái nṛmṇāya nr-manā- su-vajra (SK!) SL
- *b) bhāvā vṛdhāḥ raayá- śuśmīn asyá (SK!) ×RH+(!)
- d) mahái ksatrāya sūra pāuṃsiyāi ca (SK!) R×I+
- 2 a) tuvām havantai háviyam ví-vāci (cf. Co.) (SK!) +R×d(!)
- b) sūrāḥ tanūnām súuraś ca sātāu (N.B.) (SK!) S+RI
- c) tuvām víśvaiṣu sáiniyaḥ jánaiṣu R
- d) tuvām vṛtrā randhayā nū- su-hántū (SK!) S+×HL
- 3 a) áhā yát indra sudínā ví-ucchān R
- b) dádhaḥ yát kaitúm upamám samátso =
- c) ní agní- sīdat ásurāḥ ná háutā (N.B.) (SK!) (cf. G.) HR(!)
- d) huvānāḥ átra yajáthāya daivān (SK vs. kavi!) +(!)

(3d=SK's *var.* vs. VII, 11, 3+17, 3=h.1.!)

- | | |
|--|---------------------|
| 4 a) vayāṃ tay indra táva yá+iva nāraḥ | (c. V, 33, 5) S×+ |
| b) sárdhaḥ jajñānāḥ yáatām sa-rātham | (X, 32, 9b) SR+A(!) |
| c) yácchā sūribhyaḥ utá nā- várūtham | (N.B.) (SK!) SL+(!) |
| d) su-ābhúvaḥ jaraṇām c-+aśnavāma(!) | (N.B.) (SK!) ×R * |

(For 4b cf. X, 65, 4d+32, 9b=SK!)

- | | |
|--|----------------------|
| 5 a) vaucāima indram maghāvānam ainam(!) | (cf. bc!) ×R(?) |
| = ainām vaucāima maghāvānam indar- | (SK!) ×+HR(!) |
| b) mahāḥ raay- rādhaḥ sã(!) dádā- naḥ | (SK!) SHR+L(!) |
| c) yāḥ(!) árcataḥ bráhma-kṛtīm áviṣṭhaḥ | (SK!) HIL(!) |
| d) yūyam daivāḥ pāt-+abhísī sádā naḥ | (N.B.) (SK!) SI+H(!) |

(For special samples, as in V, 33, cf.: 1abcd+4abc+5abd(!) — Would-be-critic, « jāgrhi »!).

III. - RESULTS

The *chief result* of the above study is the fact of the prosodical *accent-value as equivalently long*. The archaic metrical prosody had a whole series of *factors*: *number of syllables, rhythm-pattern, yati or yati-like position, archaic saṃdhi-system, words and forms, accent (actual or potential) and, syllable-quantity* (in the traditional sense). Of all these, the SK has at his unchanged disposal — besides the *main* rhythm pattern — *only* (like the *post-vedic* prosody) *quantity*, while having practically *lost* also another wide-ranging and (for him) disturbing factor: *haplogy*. This is a problem not of his own making but born of the linguistic-philological evolution. His « vidūṣaka-pañḍitry » is rooted not in his (well-meant) « intentions » or on any ignorance of *his own* language-stage, but in his naive presumption that *he* can do justice to his « salto mortale » *transposition with quantity alone as rhythm-builder* within a vastly younger + different cast-iron saṃdhi-system and language-stage. No wonder his product is (as it was bound to be) so palimpsestingly catastrophic for his « dynamic editorialism », sitting between the *two incompatible stools of preservation and reformation* of a hymn-collection, as described further up. Hence the « *rule of thumb* » for a ṛgvedic text-critic (who is aware of the SK's *all-pervading* « love's labour lost! ») is: try to build, with the SK's wording, verses that are *perfectly rhythmical, sense-making and idiomatic, but archaic* (that is, of a type that the SK, with *his* vyākaraṇa and saṃdhis and vocabulary, could not possibly stomach), then scrutinise the parallels — and you are on the right way (if not already there!) to the ṛṣi-kavis own text *behind* the *Saṃhitā-Palimpsest*. In our texts above, on the right-hand margin, we give the *symbols* of the *re-archaisation* steps demanded by the SK's frantic efforts to dodge the (for him) unbearable offences against *his* vyākaraṇa and other « editorial » preconceptions which for

him (as a later « śiṣṭa ») are inviolably sacrosanct. And how shrewdly acrobatic those dodges often are — but how vidūṣaka-like vis-à-vis of the ṛṣi-kavis' own genuine words! Just tinsel vs. gold!

(Here we would like to honour our late guru, Prof. Dr. W. Schulze, who, with his « Quaestiones Epicae », inspired us, he, the successful pioneer of a similar *text-critical re-archaisation of Homer's archaic epic verses*, showing that « *non dormitat Homerus* ». — « *nā u muhyanti ṛṣayaḥ* ». — « *nāmaḥ gurūbhyaḥ* »!).

The *total convergent and mutually supporting* witness of the texts above from the *whole* Ṛgveda is ample proof positive that points to the *one SK-agency* as the palimpsesting source of the « traditional » Saṃhitā-text. The ideal would be to have the Saṃhitā-version side by side for comparison, but for obvious editorial reasons, that task will have to be left to the interested reader with the aid of our transcript which indicates all the *non-Saṃhitā* details.

As for *special text-critical results*, we can point out — besides the two « shibboleth » stanzas (which fairly bristle with « new »-archaic readings) and the two riddle test-texts, X, 32, 9ab+I, 141, 8 (for would-be-critics!) the texts: X, 65, 4d+II, 19, 1b+I, 115, 2d+II, 19, 8ab+X, 39, 4b+VI, 1, 2d+II, 34, 11cd+I, 62, 3ab+VI, 51, 11acd+II, 20, 2ab+III, 59, 8+X, 45, 6d!+X, 53, 4c+5a — hence practically in *every* text examined, and that not only in the mere *scanning* of the verses, but also in their contents and sense. (Hence neo-lexicographer « jāgṛhi »!). The above depalimpsested text-form is the *ṛṣi-kavis' own* on the *whole* and in *essentials*, at times in *all* details too, but in other cases it is open to further improvement in the light of eventual new parallel or convergent factors rediscovered — yet *always along the same method and principles here advocated*! We are constantly seeking and finding such new aids in a deeper and more comprehensive insight into the SK's multi-faceted and multi-layered « method-in-madness and madness-in-method ». The *asterisk*-marked texts (above) indicate our *new* findings, which are also in the process of publication.

And we urgently request the constructive cooperation of all earnest and competent ṛgvedic scholars and text-critical specialists. It is a glorious task, both facilitated and hindered by the SK's palimpsested bamboo-curtain of *his* Saṃhitā-text — *behind* and *through* and *beyond* which shimmers the radiant « darśana » of the long-suffering ṛṣi-kavis' own UR-Ṛgveda « śivāḥ santu pānthāḥ »!

APPENDIX

For a token-specimen of the *text-critical progress* possible and actual we reproduce our « shibboleth »-texts (*supra*) in the *definitive* form attained since the above essay was given to the press, while time and other editorial and technical considerations prevent us, to our regret, from doing it *here*.

V, 33, 5

a) vayāṃ tay indra tāva yā+iva nāraḥ (N.B.) (SK!) ×+SHA(!)

- b) *sárdhāḥ jajñānāḥ yaatām sa-rātham* (N.B.) (SK!) S+RIA(!)
 c) *sá tvāṇi naḥ āhi-śuśma á jagamyāḥ* (N.B.) (SK!) ×S+RA(!)
 d) *pitūḥ ná nāma prabhṛthái+su-hāvaḥ* (N.B.) (SK!) (i)VHS×
- VII, 30, 4
 a) *vayām tay indra táva yá+iva nāraḥ* (SK!) S+HA(!)
 b) *sárdhāḥ jajñānāḥ yaatām sa-rātham* (N.B.) (SK!) S+RIA(!)
 c) *yáčchā-sūribhyaḥ utá-nā+várūtham* (N.B.) (SK!) HS+L(!)
 d) *á+jāraṇām su-ābhúv+áśnavāma* (N.B.) (SK!) R×IH+L(!)
- X, 65, 4
 a) *súvar-ṇaram antárikṣā+ut+áraucayan* (N.B.) (SK!) RS+HS(!)
 b) *dyāvā-bhūmī áujasā cāskabhúḥ ca yái* (N.B.) (SK!) d+×I(!)
 c) *tá+ivā pṛkṣāḥ maháyantā+su-rātáyāḥ* (N.B.) (SK!) ×LHI(!)
 d) *daivá+stavantai mánuṣāsa+sūráyāḥ* (N.B.) (SK!) +H(!)
- X, 32, 9
 a) *aitām naḥ kūru-śravaṇam kriyāta* (N.B.) (SK!) +SIA(!)
 b) *kalāśam bhadrā dádataḥ maghāni* (N.B.) (SK!) ×A(!)
 c) *dānāḥ it vaḥ maghavānā+śá astu* (SK!) LH
 d) *ayām ca sáumaḥ hṛtsú yām bibhṛmāḥ* (N.B.) (SK!) +L(!)